Three-Year Audit Template

Introduction to the tool

The three-year audit template was developed by FishChoice and is based on the FisheryProgress FIP Review Guidelines and feedback from the FisheryProgress Technical Oversight Committee. The audit template is designed to present key information about the current performance of the fishery and to verify reported progress on www.FisheryProgress.org. **FisheryProgress requires the use of three-year audit template and information must be in English.**

Text in italics provides additional guidance about information that should be included in each section. Text in red provide examples for possible responses.

Basic FIP information

Fill in the following table. The management authority is the regulatory authority with fishing management responsibilities; there may be multiple authorities where joint jurisdictional responsibilities occur.

Target species scientific name and common name	Brown crab (*Cancer pagurus*) and European lobster (*Homarus gammarus*)
Fishery location	Western Channel (VIIe) and Bristol Channel (VIIf) (brown crab & lobster) and part of Celtic Sea North (VIIg) (lobster only)
Gear type(s)	Pot/creel
Catch quantity (weight)	6152t
Vessel type(s) and size(s)	Range greatly dependent on whether vessel is targeting offshore (typically crabbers beyond the 6nm) or inshore. Offshore vessels >12m, inshore vessels <10m.

Number of vessels	Approximate estimate is over 1000 vessels. Extremely hard to get an accurate estimate based on large size of UoA.
Management authority	English fishery management organisation: Defra, MMO, Cefas

Stakeholder consultation & meetings

Fill in the following table and include a high-level summary of the subjects that were discussed. Additional rows may need to be added or modified depending on number of participants and meetings completed.

Name	Affiliation	Date and Subjects Discussed
Ewen Bell	Cefas	30th April 2019 • Annual review of second year of the FIP • Harvest Strategy needs for crab fishery • Brexit update form Defra • Alternative measures report • Cefas ETP report review 13th August 2019 • Chinese market impact on crab stock • Brexit update form Defra • Secondary species report • Formation of FMP
Ros Macintyre	Cefas	
Paul Trebilcock	CFPO	
Craig Baldwin	Cornwall college	
Colin trundle	Cornwall IFCA	
Helen Hunter	Defra	
Simon Dixon	Defra	
Matthew Johnson	Defra	
Joanna Messini	Defra	
Coco Bagley	Defra	
Sarah Clark	Devon IFCA	
Lauren Parkhouse	Devon IFCA	
Laky Zervudachi	Direct Seafoods	
Ed Polley	falfish	
Mark Greet	falfish	
Nathan de Rozarieux	Falfish	
Jessika Inkster	Falfish	
Alan Steer	Fishing industry	12th February 2020 • MSC crab market presentation • Introduction to Shellfish Industry Advisory Group • Bait research flagged for investigation • Project UK rebranding and website discussion 21st July 2020 • Catch composition review • ETP species review • Results of bait species analysis
Estelle Brennan	Lyons	
Robyn Cloake	Lyons	
Claire Pescod	Macduff	
Hubert Gieschen	MMO	
Madalein Bradshaw	MMO	
Daisy May	MMO	
Rachel Irish	MMO	
Joseph Prosho	Morrisons	
Rob Whiteley	Natural England	
John Balls	North Devon Fishermens Association	

		• Requirement for Productivity, Susceptibility Analysis (PSA)
Tom Hooper	Scilly Isles IFCA	19th January 2021 • MSC certification process • Update on stock status from Cefas • Government FMP template update • Harvest strategy and HCR update 21st January 2021 • PSA presentation • ETP reporting mechanism • Harvest strategy sub-group formation • FMP update 24th June 2021 • MSC crab market update • Annual review • Alternative bait discussion • Harvest Strategy update
Gus Caslake	Seafish SW	
Neville Pittman	Seafood & Eat It	
Beshlie Pool	South Devon and Channel Shellfishermen	
Chloe Smith	Southern IFCA	
Simon Pengelly	Southern IFCA	
Helena Delgado-Nordmann	Tesco	
David Markham	The Blue Sea Food Co	
Trevor Bartlett	The Blue Sea Food Co	
Emma Rowse	the real cornish crab company	
William Harvey	W Harvey & Sons	
Martyn Youell	Waterdance	
Hayley Swanlund	WWF	
Abigayil Blandon	WWF	

Summary of MSC performance indicator scores

Fill in the likely scoring category (<60, 60-79, ≥80) for each performance indicator (PI) and provide a rationale for the score by referring to the text used in v2.0 of the MSC Standard's scoring guideposts for the related Performance Indicator.

Principle	Component	Performance Indicator		Current Score	Rationale and Justification
1	Outcome	1.1.1	Stock status	>80	Brown crab: Stock size high in Western Channel and above minimum ref points for females in the Celtic Sea. Exploitation rate for both stocks is moderate and at or around MSY. European lobster: Stock size above minimum reference point but below MSY target. Exploitation rate is moderate, slightly above rates consistent with MSY but below maximum reference point limits.
		1.1.2	Stock rebuilding	N/A	
	Management	1.2.1	Harvest Strategy	60-79	Harvest strategy needs to be progressed further to provide an explicit and complimentary strategy across the varying management areas – IFCA inshore (6nm) and MMO offshore. Some evidence of harmonization across most of the inshore area and government undertaking a call of evidence which may support an explicit harvest strategy further.
		1.2.2	Harvest control rules and tools	<60	Incomplete harvest strategy with regional HCRs in place to manage stock which are not harmonised across UoA of the FIP.
		1.2.3	Information and monitoring	60-79	Some information related to stock structure, stock productivity and fleet composition. However, large uncertainties around reliable potting effort data (within 6nm and outside 6nm).
		1.2.4	Assessment of stock status	80	The assessment is appropriate for the stock and estimates the status relative to reference points. The assessment identifies some sources of uncertainty but does not take them into account.
2	Primary species	2.1.1	Outcome	80	The only main primary species caught in the edible crab potting fishery is lobster, and vice versa. Other

					primary species, such as occasional catches of cod and bass, are likely to be minor and will not affect scoring below 80, regardless of status. For bait the only primary species listed as main is mackerel, with the use of it as bait unlikely to cause any effect to overall stock.
		2.1.2	Management strategy	80	The only main primary species (outside of target fishery for this FIP) is mackerel which should reach SG 80 under P2.1. FIP not expected to not hinder rebuilding of mackerel to levels which are highly likely to be above the PRI.
		2.1.3	Information	80	Qualitative and some quantitative information is available through the RBS & shellfish return data collection
	Secondary species	2.2.1	Outcome	80	'Main' secondary species are highly likely to be above biologically based limits.
		2.2.2	Management strategy	60-79	Further management strategy for secondary species required. The bait sources used come from utilization of landing due to Landing Obligation and potential for FIP to potentially use other bait sources.
		2.2.3	Information	80	Adequate information known of main secondary species, PSA analysis used in support of this.
	ETP species	2.3.1	Outcome	80	No ETP species associated with this fishery were identified in the catch composition review. Therefore, known direct effects of the UoA are highly likely to not hinder recovery of ETP species.
		2.3.2	Management strategy	80	Strategy in place to record ETP interaction, with regular review of the system. FIP still needs to inform wider UoA FIP members of the South Devon and Channel Shellfishermen recording process as well as roll out ID charts for elasmobranchs more widely.
		2.3.3	Information	80	Some quantitative information available, that there were no interactions, to assess UoA related mortality of ETP species.
	Habitats	2.4.1	Outcome	80	The static gear used to prosecute the fishery is in contact with the bottom, but unlikely to have significant interaction with vulnerable habitats. The

					habitat risk of this fishery has been identified as low risk. Evidence suggests fishery impact on the bottom is restricted to some abrasion caused by dragging pots and anchors during hauling and tide and wave action (Grieve et al., 2014). There are a significant number of areas given environmental protection designation within this fishery, comprising mainly SACs, SPAs, and MCZs.
		2.4.2	Management strategy	80	This strategy is likely to work, and there is previous evidence of measures being implemented in order to protect at-risk habitats (e.g. ban on benthic gear in certain areas). Quantitative evidence exists to show the strategy is being implemented successfully.
		2.4.3	Information	80	Active monitoring of areas subject to specific environmental designation does take place, and irregular sampling and monitoring of habitat outside these areas is also conducted, though primarily inside the 6nm limit. Ongoing monitoring for habitat risks forms part of the strategy.
	Ecosystem	2.5.1	Outcome	80	There is a presumption that static potting gear impact on the ecosystem is low risk and this has been borne out by studies to date. Some specific assessment of parts of the Start Point managed area (subject to the Start Point Inshore Potting Agreement) has been undertaken, and this has shown overall improvements in biodiversity where mobile gear has been seasonally or totally banned in an area, and where potting continues to be conducted.
		2.5.2	Management strategy	80	There is an increasing focus on ecosystem management in Fisheries Act – through requirement for FMPs - and ICES advisory level (WGCRAB), and where designated areas are subject to specific environmental management (SPAs, SACs, MCZs and VMEs).

		2.5.3	Information	80	The work of the IFCAs and their predecessor Sea Fisheries Committees has ensured improved knowledge and awareness of the state of the marine environment within the 6nm inshore regime. This has been substantially enhanced with the national policy to identify and establish Marine Conservation Zones (MCZs), to support the assessment by Cefas of shellfish stocks in inshore English waters, and the need to design and implement an FMP under the UK Fisheries Act.
3	Governance and Policy	3.1.1	Legal and customary framework	80	The Western English Channel edible crab fisheries take place exclusively within waters governed by the the Territorial Seas of England, France and the Channel Islands. There is therefore a need in the MSC requirements of both an "effective national legal system" and also "organised and effective cooperation with other parties", which there is. Management is informed by data collection and stock assessments on the basis of stock units – which are organised by Cefas and Ifremer. Scientists from UK and EU member states collaborate effectively in the provision of stock and biological information through ICES, which provides oversight in respect of management of crab stocks and exploitation through WGCRAB. Within the UK there is an effective national legal system implementing domestic fisheries law. More local interests are represented in inshore management regimes applying in sea areas out to 6nm from baseline. Along the English coast within area VIIe these are under the management of the D&C IFCA, the Cornwall IFCA and the IoS IFCA.
		3.1.2	Consultation, roles and responsibilities	80	These crab fisheries are managed at national and local levels. The management unit for stock purposes is the Western English Channel edible crab stock unit,

					with management from a UK perspective vested in the MMO outside 6nm, and the IFCAs inside 6nm. The division of responsibility for management of non-quota shellfish, such as edible crab, is poorly defined – both management and science. The Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009 gives joint responsibility between MMO and IFCAs. MoUs seek to clarify, but are still not explicit, instead talks in terms of general principles of collaboration & joint working. The MoU recognizes that further guidance is necessary.
		3.1.3	Long term objectives	80	Clear long term objectives consistent with MSC principles and criteria are explicit in management system at EU/UK level. There is also explicit mention of the Precautionary Approach and the Ecosystem based approach to fisheries management. At the UK level, the Marine & Coastal Access Act 2009 which establishes the MMO, states that the organisation must operate in accordance with the Government's principles of sustainable development.
	Fishery specific management system	3.2.1	Fishery specific objectives	60-79	Short and long-term fishery specific objectives not harmonized across the UoA of the FIP and not explicit. Need for focus on outside the 6nm and for all objectives to be logged in the FIP's FMP.
		3.2.2	Decision making processes	80	Decision-making is achieved at a national level through the MMO, with significant professional inputs from the research laboratories (Cefas with respect to England and Wales), the Shellfish Committee of the Shellfish Association of Great Britain (SAGB), the Shellfish Committee of the Seafish Industry Authority, the IFCAs (England and Wales) and Inshore Fisheries Groups (Scotland), and Fishermen's Organisations and Producer Organisations.
		3.2.3	Compliance and enforcement	80	Compliance is good but variable. Monitoring and surveillance systems are well established and functioning well – to the limits of their design and available resources (given that there are no formal

					limits to the number of pots that can be fished by a vessel, and minimal controls on the minimum or maximum days a vessel can operate in a year.) Key controls comprise effort limitations under the EU Western Waters regime, variable access rules between IFCAs (including a permit scheme run by Cornwall IFCA) and applying to specific management areas (Start Point Inshore Potting Agreement; designated conservation areas), and technical measures (primarily minimum landing sizes – noting that there are some differences between IFCAs). Enforcement is exercised through the submission of landings data under the Buyers and Sellers Regulation, at sea observation and occasional at sea inspections (by IFCAs, and by the Sea Fisheries Inspectorate and the Royal Navy), and market / trader inspections.
		3.2.4	Management performance evaluation	80	The ICES Working Group WGCRAB considers information and comments on management, but this could not be considered a fishery-specific management review. The UK crab fishery is subject to a very course form of overall management (and objective), but each region tends to seek to achieve management in its own way – and so a clear management strategy and objective is not established. Management of the Western English Channel edible crab stock / fishery can be viewed as a mosaic of different regimes – disaggregated on the basis of whether conducted inside or outside the 6nm inshore limit, and whether or not subject to further restrictions associated with a particular area management designation (whether for environmental reasons, or to achieve some degree of gear separation).

					The Cefas Western Channel stock assessment is used to inform local management decisions – which are made separately by each IFCA within a framework formulated by the MMO. These controls are reviewed locally, but not on a coherent basis. These management decisions are, however, subject to periodic review by the SAGB Shellfish Committee.

Workplan results

Fill in the following table by reviewing the FIP's workplan and summarizing the key results that have been achieved over the last three years (or since the last audit took place) as a result of the FIP's workplan. Provide an explanation of steps that the FIP participants took in supporting and achieving each result.

Result	Related Action on FisheryProgress	Related MSC Performance Indicator	Explanation
Alternative measures report 2019	Primary & Secondary Species Management Strategies	2.1.2, 2.2.2.	Alternative measures report produced to review ways in which the FIP could minimise UoA-related mortality of all non-target primary and secondary species caught in the fishery. The crab pre-assessment indicated that bycatch levels can be seen to be very low as a percentage of total catch weight with only Lobster, which is a secondary commercially valuable species, totalling over 1%. Bycatch is occasional only spider crab above the 'main' thresholds. Other species which are bycaught include velvet crab, wrasse, conger eel and some mixed ray species. In order to improve the scoring of P2.1.2 a review to further reduce such catches is seen as relevant. Findings indicated that a number of gear designs and modifications have been adopted by industry to minimise the mortality of target and non-target species e.g. alternative measures. The most effective of these being escape gaps fitted to pots to allow juvenile crabs and lobsters and non-target species to easily escape. Due to the low impact nature of the fishery non target specimens too large to escape can be released alive on retrieval of the pots.
Development of a Fishery Management Plan 2019	Fishery-specific objectives	3.2.1	The development of an FMP began in 2019 to help log all the documentation and progress the FIP had made to date. The FIP decided to align with the Shellfish Industry Advisory Group (SIAG) around management objectives and an adequate harvest strategy.

Catch composition review 2021	Primary & Secondary Species Management Strategies, Secondary Species	2.1.2., 2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3	In 2020, the Steering Group conducted a review of Principle 2 actions for the Project UK crab and lobster Fishery Improvement Project (FIP. This process aimed to ascertain a breakdown of catch composition associated with the fishery and to gain an understanding of bait use within the Unit of Assessment (UoA), the species being used and in what quantities. This report indicated that there is one 'main' bycatch species in the fishery, spider crab, with all other species caught as bycatch being listed as minor. Furthermore, within the catch composition data that was received there were no ETP species identified as bycatch. However, this may not mean that ETP species do not interact with the fishery, but that none were recorded. In terms of bait use, there were 14 sources identified, of which three would need further investigation: mackerel, dogfish and red gurnard, with one, mixed ray backs, not required for further investigation and will be explained in section two.
Bait Productivity Susceptibility Analysis report 2021	Secondary Species	2.2.1, 2.2.3	Steering Group decided it was necessary to conduct a review of 'main' bait sources for the Project UK crab and lobster Fishery Improvement Project (FIP), as identified in the FIP's catch composition review (see above). Within the aforementioned paper three bait sources were identified to be taken forward for a productivity, susceptibility analysis (PSA): mackerel, red gurnard and Dogfish spp. As Dogfish spp. did not apply to a specific species the FIP followed the Standard guidance and conducted a PSA analysis on all relevant species to which Dogfish spp could apply to, with the species having the lowest PSA score acting as its proxy result. No species were listed as a 'high-risk' bait source. Red gurnard and lesser spotted catshark scored above 80 and all other species assessed under Dogfish spp scored above 70. Common smooth hound was identified as the proxy for Dogfish spp with the lowest PSA score (72); however, discussion at the last Steering Group meeting indicated that lesser spotted catshark was more likely to be used as a bait source.

Endangered, Threatened and Protected species review 2021	ETP species	2.3.1, 2.3.2, 2.3.3	In 2020, the Steering Group conducted a review of Principle 2 actions for the Project UK crab and lobster Fishery Improvement Project (FIP. This process aimed to update the FIP's Endangered, Threatened and Protected (ETP) species list and get group sign off. The new ETP list was based on work previously conducted on behalf of Project UK and incorporated a new round of consultation with industry and the British Divers Marine Life Rescue to update the list. Three species were identified as at risk of interaction with the fishery: leatherback turtle, minke whale and basking shark. Humpback whale was considered as potential risk of interaction with the fishery due to the effects of climate change increasing the risk of interaction. Notably, giant goby was deemed a low risk species for a variety of reasons that will be elaborated upon in section three.